the method and parameter data are adapted to be passed to a machine as part of an event registration message,

the event registration message further includes event information identifying the event of interest and software information identifying a software entity to be notified upon occurrence of the event, and

upon occurrence of the event, the method and parameter data execute to pass at least one of the computer object and reference to the computer object to the software entity.--

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5–9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,343,308 B1 ("*Marchesseault*"). The Examiner also cited, but did not apply, U.S. Patent 5,774,729 ("*Carney*") and U.S. Patent 6,003,050 ("*Silver*"). Because the Examiner did not establish a prima facie case for rejecting claims 5–9 over *Marchesseault*, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of these claims. Claims 14 and 15 are allowable for the same reasons that claim 5 is allowable.

Amendment

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 5 and 8 to more particularly claim the invention. In the attached Appendix, deletions to the claims are indicated by square brackets and insertions are indicated by underlining. Applicants have also added new claims 16–22.

Claims 5–9

Marchesseault discloses systems for running Java applets written in any version of the Java programming language ("Java version") within any version of a Java Virtual

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Machine ("JVM") without requiring separate applets written in each Java version that correspond to the version of the JVM. (*Marchesseault*, col. 1, lines 61–67.) The Background section of *Marchesseault* states that Java is an object-oriented programming language, which is compiled and run on any machine using a JVM. (*Id.*, col. 1, lines 15–21.) Web browsers include a version of the JVM. (*Id.*, col. 1, lines 24–30.) There are multiple versions of Java source code (*e.g.*, 1.0 and 1.1), which include classes not recognized by lower versions of JVMs (*e.g.*, JVM 1.0 will not recognize certain classes unique to Java version 1.1). (*Id.*, col. 1, lines 42–57.) *Marchesseault* addresses this characteristic by a class interface. (*Id.*, col. 2, lines 9–13.) The class interface includes identifiers for object classes of Java versions different from the JVM version. (*Id.*) Thus, if an applet includes calls to multiple Java versions, a class identifier is also downloaded, which allows the JVM to call those Java versions it recognizes without the disruption of calling versions it does not recognize. (*Id.*, col. 2, lines 23–35.) That is, *Marchesseault* discloses systems for running multiple Java versions on a single JVM. It does not, however, disclose a "second virtual machine" or a "third virtual machine," as recited in claim 5. Therefore, because *Marchesseault* fails to disclose each element of claim 5, it cannot be alleged to anticipate claim 5.

The Examiner mistakenly interprets the phrase "the applet includes at least one call to an object class associated with a second Java version of the Java Virtual Machine" (*Marchesseault*, col. 12, lines 1–3), as "a second virtual machine executing a process that receives," as recited in claim 5 (Paper No. 9, at 3). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of *Marchesseault*. There is clearly no disclosure in the passage cited by the Examiner or elsewhere in *Marchesseault* to

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

support the Examiner's position. As *Marchesseault* makes clear, "a second Java version" refers to different versions of the Java programming language (*see*, *e.g.*, *Marchesseault*, col. 1, lines 13–15 and 42–45), whereas a Java Virtual Machine refers to a portion of a Java runtime system used to run Java source code (*see*, *e.g.*, *id.*, col. 1, lines 15–21). Accordingly, *Marchesseault* fails to disclose, at least, a "second virtual machine" as recited in claim 5.

Further, *Marchesseault* does not disclose a third virtual machine as recited in claim 5. Instead, as explained, *Marchesseault* at best discloses a single JVM that may compensate for various versions of class objects.

Because *Marchesseault* fails to disclose each element of claim 5, Applicants request that the rejection of the claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn and the claim allowed. Further, claims 6–9 should likewise be allowed at least because of their dependence from claim 5. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 16–22

Applicants have added claims 16–22 to further recite that which the Applicants believe is allowable subject matter. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the timely allowance of these claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 10, 2003

By: E. Niemeyer
Elizabeth A. Niemeyer
Reg. No. 52,070

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com